

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

MANNO BEAM,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	1:18CV52
)	
KATY POOLE, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

On April 30, 2018, the United States Magistrate Judge's Order and Recommendation was filed and notice was served on the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. Plaintiff did not file objections within the time limit prescribed by Section 636 for asserting objections to the Recommendation. Plaintiff instead filed a response styled as an amended complaint. (Doc. 7.) Plaintiff also filed a letter motion (Doc. 8) seeking to add to his complaint his pending claim with the Industrial Commission. Plaintiff subsequently filed a substantially similar second amended complaint (Doc. 9) along with a new application (Doc. 10) to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

The court has reviewed the amended complaint, the letter motion, and the second amended complaint, but notes that the amendments were not filed on the appropriate forms for bringing a § 1983 action, and the proposed amendments do not include all of

the relevant information for asserting a claim. For example, the proposed amendments do not identify who is being named as a defendant. Therefore, the proposed amendments will be denied without prejudice to Plaintiff refiling his claims on the proper forms, correcting the defects cited in the Recommendation.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action be filed and DISMISSED *sua sponte* without prejudice to Plaintiff filing a new complaint on the proper § 1983 forms.

/s/ Thomas D. Schroeder
United States District Judge

August 14, 2018